

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claim 1 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the application based upon the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 3, objects to claim 3 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. This claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants appreciate this indication of allowability.

The Office Action, on page 2, objects to the Disclosure for informalities. The Disclosure has been amended to obviate this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the Disclosure for informalities is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,009,522 to Hahn. Additionally, the Office Action, on page 3, rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn and further in view of JP-A-07-027127 to Aoyama. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Hahn teaches the features as positively recited in claim 1. This assertion is incorrect. Hahn teaches an oil groove 44, as illustrated in Fig. 2, that extends from one eccentric end portion 36 to the opposite eccentric end portion. As illustrated in Fig. 2 of Hahn, the oil groove 44 extends into the area of the eccentric end portions. Therefore, Hahn cannot reasonably be considered to teach, nor to have suggested, that the oil groove does not extend into the crush relief such that a depth of the oil groove is rendered to be zero at the inner edge of the crush relief of the corresponding bearing member, as positively recited in amended claim 1. Aoyama does not overcome the deficiencies, as identified above, of Hahn, as applied to the subject matter of the pending claims.

For at least the above reasons, Hahn and Aoyama, cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features recited in at least independent claim 1. Further, claim 2 would also not have been suggested by the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of this claim on allowable independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 2, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a), as being unpatentable over the combination of applied prior art references, are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkhimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB/jam

Attachment:

Substitute Specification (marked-up and clean copies)

Date: March 9, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--